Variation of the fine-structure constant and the electron-proton mass ratio in simple ions

Natalia S. Oreshkina, Stefano M. Cavaletto, Niklas Michel, Zoltán Harman, and Christoph H. Keitel
Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik, Saupfercheckweg 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany
(Dated: March 30, 2017)

Numerous few-electron atomic systems are considered, which can be effectively used for observing a potential variation of the fine-structure constant α and the electron-proton mass ratio m_e/m_p. We examine magnetic dipole transitions between hyperfine-structure components in heavy highly charged H-like and Li-like ions with observably high sensitivity to a variation of α and m_e/m_p. The experimental spectra of the proposed systems consist of only one, strong line, which simplifies significantly the data analysis and shortens the necessary measurement time. Furthermore, we discuss that the contribution of possible systematic effects is much lower than in other systems proposed for such purposes.

arXiv:1703.09943v1 [physics.atom-ph] 29 Mar 2017

INTRODUCTION

The variation of fundamental constants has been discussed in theories beyond the Standard Model, in unification theories and as a feature of cosmological evolution [1–3]. Experiments have focused on dimensionless fundamental constants, such as the fine-structure constant α, the electron-proton mass ratio m_e/m_p, and the light quark masses on the quantum chromodynamic scale $m_q/\Lambda_{\rm QCD}$. Astrophysical spectra from objects on a distance of a few billions light years are consistent with predictions based on a variation of the electron-proton mass ratio [4] and the fine-structure constant [5–7], but the assigned errors are on the order of 100%. Latest studies suggest that α is changing not only in time, but also in space [8]. In addition to astrophysical measurements, also high-precision laboratory measurements of atomic and molecular transitions would allow one to observe possible variations of the fundamental constants in time and space. Thereby, one could set limitations to these variations via atomic clocks. Measurements for different types of transitions provide various constraints for the variation limits; the more systems with different properties are observed, the more limitations can be set.

The sensitivity of the transition to the electron-proton mass ratio is fully determined by the system considered: molecular, atomic or hyperfine-splitting transition [9, 10]. Therefore, different types of clocks have to be compared to address this variation. In the case of the variation of the quark masses, nuclear-structure-sensitive transitions need to be considered. The situation is different for the fine-structure constant. The sensitivity to its variation strongly depends on the chosen system and can vary significantly. Consequently, this constant has received a great deal of interest from both experimental and theoretical sides [11–14]. Probing the variation of α in highly charged ions (HCIs) has two great advantages. First, since electrons in HCIs are relativistic, they are hence very sensitive to the α-variation; being tightly bound, they are also much less sensitive to external perturbations than neutral atoms or low-charged ions, leading to smaller possible systematic effects. Moreover, HCIs already proved to be important and auspicious systems for high-precision tests of quantum electrodynamics (QED) [15–17], in laboratory astrophysical measurements [18–21], and in the precise determination of fundamental constants [22–25]. Therefore, outstanding experimental techniques are already developed in HCI research. Recently, activities towards the experimental observation of a potential α-variation have been started [26, 27] on highly charged Pm-like Ir^{17+}, one of the most α-sensitive stable atomic systems [28]. However, the extremely rich spectrum of Ir^{17+} renders the identification of the lines of interest very challenging. Also from the theoretical side, the large amount of interacting electrons requires highly time-consuming calculations and limits severely the accuracy of predictions. Other possible ions [13, 14, 29], which were proposed for their high sensitivity to the α-variation, have a similarly complex atomic structure, which also renders predictions uncertain.

The above-mentioned complex systems were selected as candidates for the experimental observation of α-variation due to the fact that they fulfill three conditions, which are usually [14, 29] considered to be necessary. First, the transition-energy variation ΔE caused by the possible variation of fundamental constants should be larger than the experimental accuracy $\delta E_{\rm exp}$ with which the transition energy can be determined

$$\Delta E > \delta E_{\rm exp}; \tag{1}$$

second, the linewidth Γ should not be too large, such that the transition-energy variation can be resolved:

$$\Delta E > \Gamma; \tag{2}$$

and third, an optical transition is needed for high precision measurements on a $\sim 10^{-19}$ fractional uncertainty level [14, 29], based on the current status of spectroscopy experiments. Despite the existing proofs [12, 30] that the *intra*configuration transitions can be used as α-sensitive atomic clocks, only *inter*configuration transitions, i.e., transitions between different many-electronic configurations [14, 28, 29], have received a lot of interest from the experimental side as potentially highly α-sensitive transitions.

In the current Letter, we demonstrate that *intra*configuration transitions which are sensitive to the α-variation can be efficiently used in laboratory experiments in order to revive experimental interest in these systems. This allows us to enrich the actual list of the systems with observable α-sensitivity, by considering transitions between the hyperfine structure (HFS) components of heavy H-like and Li-like HCIs with the simplest atomic structure. Additionally, we show how the variation in time of other important quantities, i.e., the electron-proton mass ratio m_e/m_p and the light quark masses on the quantum chromodynamic scale $m_{q,s}/\Lambda_{\rm QCD}$, contributes to the HFS and can be potentially measured in an experiment. We also simulate the spectral measurement scheme in a time-dependent way to establish the range of interest of atomic parameters. By analyzing the present experimental capabilities, we relax condition (2) in contrast to level-crossing many-electron systems, although we keep condition (1) and the requirement for the transition energy to be in the optical range, facilitating this way an experimental implementation.

SENSITIVITY OF THE HYPERFINE SPLITTING OF HEAVY H-LIKE AND LI-LIKE IONS TO THE VARIATION OF FUNDAMENTAL CONSTANTS

To characterize how sensitive a transition energy E is to the potential change of different fundamental constants, the enhancement factors K are introduced following Refs. [10–12, 14, 31] as

$$\frac{\Delta E}{E} = K_\alpha \frac{\Delta\alpha}{\alpha} + K_{e/p}\frac{\Delta(m_e/m_p)}{m_e/m_p} + K_q \frac{\Delta(m_q/\Lambda_{\rm QCD})}{m_q/\Lambda_{\rm QCD}} + K_s \frac{\Delta(m_s/\Lambda_{\rm QCD})}{m_s/\Lambda_{\rm QCD}}. \tag{3}$$

Therefore, one needs to search for an atomic system with maximized sensitivity coefficients K and, to fulfill the condition of Eq. (2), a minimized Γ.

The magnetic-dipole HFS appears as a result of the interaction of electrons with the magnetic moment of the nucleus with spin I. Hence, an energy level with fixed electron angular momentum j splits into sublevels with a total angular momentum $F = I+j, I+j-1, \ldots, |I-j|$. For the ground states of H-like and Li-like ions with $j = 1/2$, there are only two sublevels, with total angular momenta $F = I + 1/2$ and $F = I - 1/2$. For the ions with nuclear charge Z, nuclear spin I, and nuclear magnetic moment μ/μ_N, and the valence electron with principal quantum number n and orbital quantum number l, the energy of the HFS of the H-like and Li-like ions can be described with the formula [32, 33]:

$$E_\mu = \frac{\alpha(\alpha Z)^3}{n^3(2l+1)j(j+1)}\frac{m_e}{m_p}\frac{\mu}{\mu_N}\frac{2I+1}{2I} m_e c^2 \left[A(\alpha Z)(1-\delta)(1-\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{Z}B(\alpha Z) + x_{\rm rad}\right]. \tag{4}$$

Here, $A(\alpha Z)$ is a one-electron relativistic factor, which can be calculated analytically for a point-like nucleus [32, 33], or numerically for different finite-size nuclear models with the direct inclusion of the finite-nuclear-size (FNS) correction δ as $A(\alpha Z)(1-\delta)$; ε is the nuclear-magnetization distribution correction, also called the Bohr-Weisskopf (BW) correction; $x_{\rm rad}$ are QED corrections ($x_{\rm rad,Scr}$ in the case of Li-like ions are screened QED corrections, calculated with effective screening potentials [34]), and $B(\alpha Z)$ stands for interelectronic-interaction corrections of first order in $1/Z$ (only present for Li-like ions).

Sensitivity to α-variation. In the point-like-nucleus, H-like approximation, taking into account the analytical expression for $A(\alpha Z)$ [32, 33], the enhancement factor K_α for the $1s$ and $2s$ states can be presented in a simple manner by a Taylor expansion:

$$K_\alpha \begin{bmatrix} 1s \\ 2s \end{bmatrix} \equiv \frac{dE}{d\alpha}\Big/\frac{E}{\alpha} = 4 + \begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 17/4 \end{bmatrix}(\alpha Z)^2 + \begin{bmatrix} 4 \\ 5 \end{bmatrix}(\alpha Z)^4 + O\left((\alpha Z)^6\right). \tag{5}$$

It clearly indicates that HFS transitions for the states considered (and, in fact, for an arbitrary state) have a high sensitivity to a potential α-variation, and that the calculated enhancement factor K_α disagrees with the results presented in [12]. For very high Z, FNS and BW effects become important, slightly reducing the value of K_α, whereas QED and interelectronic-interaction contributions to K_α were estimated to be negligible.

Sensitivity to m_e/m_p-variation. As it is clear from Eq. (4), the sensitivity of the HFS to the potential variation of the electron-proton mass ratio m_e/m_p is the same for all the ions and equal to $K_{e/p} = 1$.

Sensitivity to the variation of quark masses $m_q/\Lambda_{\rm QCD}$ and $m_s/\Lambda_{\rm QCD}$. The procedure to estimate this effect was described in [31]. In the single-particle approximation, the magnetic moment of the nucleus is

$$\frac{\mu}{\mu_N} = \begin{cases} [g_S + (2I-1)g_L]/2 & \text{for } I = L + 1/2, \\ \dfrac{I}{2(I+1)}[-g_S + (2I+3)g_L] & \text{for } I = L - 1/2. \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Here, L stands for the orbital angular momentum of the nuclei, while the orbital g factors are $g_L = 1$ for the proton and $g_L = 0$ for the neutron, and the spin g factors $g_S = 5.586$ for the proton and $g_S = -3.826$ for the neutron. Denoting $m_q = (m_u + m_d)/2$ the averaged mass of the up and down quarks, and m_s the strange quark mass, one can

Ion	μ/μ_N	I	$A(\alpha Z)$	δ	ε	$x_{\rm rad}$	E_μ (THz)	$\Gamma/(2\pi)$ (Hz)	K_α	$K_{e/p}$	K_q	K_s
$^{113}In^{48+}$	5.5289(2)	9/2	1.2340	0.0171	0.0048	-0.0042	221.2(3)	2.84	4.43	1	-0.036	-0.005
$^{121}Sb^{50+}$	3.3634(3)	5/2	1.2581	0.0191	0.0053	-0.0047	166.6(3)	1.11	4.47	1	-0.051	-0.008
$^{133}Cs^{54+}$	2.582025(3)	7/2	1.3125	0.0236	0.0018	-0.0050	159.2(1)	1.00	4.57	1	0.110	0.016
$^{139}La^{56+}$	2.7830455(9)	7/2	1.3430	0.0263	0.0026	-0.0052	194.7(2)	1.81	4.61	1	0.110	0.016
$^{153}Eu^{62+}$	1.5324(3)	5/2	1.4509	0.0369	0.0049	-0.0061	162.0(2)	0.967	4.78	1	-0.051	-0.008
$^{159}Tb^{64+}$	2.014(4)	3/2	1.4933	0.0405	0.0070	-0.0064	265.7(8)	3.79	4.85	1	1.165	0.174
$^{171}Yb^{69+}$	0.49367(1)	1/2	1.6170	0.0540	0.0300	-0.0073	127(1)	0.270	5.02	1	-0.118	0.001
$^{189}Os^{75+}$	0.659933(4)	3/2	1.8092	0.0749	0.0216	-0.0085	160(1)	0.773	5.26	1	-0.118	0.001
$^{195}Pt^{77+}$	0.60952(6)	1/2	1.8874	0.0836	0.0377	-0.0089	243(3)	1.79	5.36	1	-0.118	0.001
$^{197}Au^{78+}$	0.1469(13)[a]	3/2	1.9297	0.0884	0.0115	-0.0091	42.5(6)	0.0142	5.40	1	1.165	0.174
$^{199}Hg^{79+}$	0.5058855(9)	1/2	1.9744	0.0934	0.0402	-0.0094	225(3)	1.39	5.45	1	-0.118	0.001
$^{207}Pb^{81+}$	0.592583(9)	1/2	2.0718	0.1047	0.0426	-0.0098	294(4)	3.04	5.56	1	-0.118	0.001
$^{235}U^{91+}$	0.38(3)	7/2	2.7978	0.1899	0.0106	-0.0125	187(15)	1.24	6.16	1	-0.118	0.001

TABLE I. Individual contributions to the hyperfine splitting (see Eq. (4)), the transition energy E_μ, the linewidth $\Gamma/(2\pi)$ of the excited state, and the sensitivity factors K_α, $K_{e/p}$, K_q, and K_s for the ground state of H-like ions.

Ion	μ/μ_N	I	$a(\alpha Z)$	$B(\alpha Z)$	$x_{\rm rad,Scr}$	E_μ (THz)	$\Gamma/(2\pi)$ (Hz)	K_α	$K_{e/p}$	K_q	K_s
$^{175}Lu^{68+}$	2.2323(11)	7/2	1.8740	-0.0739	-0.0085	51.79(3)	0.0369	5.47	1	0.110	0.016
$^{185}Re^{72+}$	3.1871(3)	5/2	1.9963	-0.0767	-0.0098	98.5(4)	0.240	5.69	1	-0.051	-0.008
$^{187}Re^{72+}$	3.2197(3)	5/2	1.9960	-0.0767	-0.0098	99.5(4)	0.247	5.69	1	-0.051	-0.008
$^{203}Tl^{78+}$	1.622257	1/2	2.2820	-0.0826	-0.0119	120.6(7)	0.261	6.07	1	-0.087	-0.013
$^{209}Bi^{80+}$	4.1106(2)	9/2	2.4065	-0.0852	-0.0127	193(1)	1.91	6.22	1	0.076	0.011
$^{231}Pa^{88+}$	2.01(2)	3/2	2.9783	-0.0990	-0.0167	185(2)	1.38	6.86	1	-0.064	-0.010

TABLE II. Individual contributions to the hyperfine splitting (see Eq. (4), $a(\alpha Z) = A(\alpha Z)(1-\delta)(1-\varepsilon)$), the transition energy E_μ, the linewidth $\Gamma/(2\pi)$ of the excited state, and sensitivity factors K_α, $K_{e/p}$, K_q, and K_s for the ground state of Li-like ions. For $^{209}Bi^{80+}$ ion, the BW correction was calculated using the specific-difference approach [32] with experimental data from [35].

calculate the QCD corrections to the proton and neutron magnetic momenta [31]:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\delta\mu_p}{\mu_p} &= -0.087\frac{\delta m_q}{m_q},\\
\frac{\delta\mu_p}{\mu_p} &= -0.013\frac{\delta m_s}{m_s},\\
\frac{\delta\mu_n}{\mu_n} &= -0.118\frac{\delta m_q}{m_q},\\
\frac{\delta\mu_n}{\mu_n} &= 0.0013\frac{\delta m_s}{m_s}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Therefore, the variation of the quark masses leads to a variation of the nuclear magnetic moment μ, and their potential variations can be also seen in high-precision experiments on the HFS of HCIs. Using Eqs. (6), (7), we calculated the enhancement factors K_q and K_s for several ions.

Results. As a general rule, the HFS sublevel with $F = I - 1/2$ is a ground state, and the sublevel with $F = I + 1/2$ is an excited state; for negative nuclear magnetic momenta μ, the HFS sublevels are reversed. The individual contributions to the energy of H-like HFS, the HFS energy, the linewidth $\Gamma/(2\pi)$ of the excited state, calculated with the formulas from Ref. [32], and the enhancement factors $K_{e/p}$, K_q, K_s, and K_α, calculated with the inclusion of FNS and BW effects for several H-like ions, are listed in Table I, and for Li-like ions in Table II. The nuclear parameters were taken from [36, 37]. The accuracy of the theoretical predictions of HFS is mostly limited by our knowledge

of the nuclear magnetic moment and by the uncertainty of the BW contribution ε [32]. Higher-order contributions, such as second-order QED corrections, two-photon exchange and rigorous screened QED corrections for Li-like ions, were found earlier [17] to be under the BW-correction uncertainty level, so they can be ignored here. Despite the relatively high uncertainty in the theoretical predictions, optical HFS can be resolved experimentally with a high accuracy [38, 39].

The enhancement factor $K_{e/p}$ is equal to 1 for the HFS transitions for all the ions considered, the enhancement factors K_q and K_s are on the level of 0.1 and less with two exceptions, which will be considered later. Therefore, the most relevant question is how good the HFS of HCIs is for the search of a potential α variation in comparison with other atomic systems. As one can see from Table I and Table II, the α-sensitivity coefficient is about 5-6 for all the ions. Exploiting the level crossing of $4f$, $5s$ and $5p$ shells allows one to find a few ions with α-sensitive narrow transitions with the sensitivity coeffitient K_α on a level of 10-100 in the optical domain [14, 28, 29]. However, for each isoelectronic sequence such transitions can be found only for one, rearly two HCIs. This restricts extremely the choice of atomic systems available for experimental observations. For H-like and Li-like HFS, in contrast, there are no such limitations, and any of the ions in Tables I and II (and other HCIs not listed there) can be used. Therefore, it is possible to choose the most suitable ion with respect to experimentally important nuclear parameters.

In the remaining of this Letter, we will mainly focus on two systems. Among all the H-like HCIs, we consider the ion featuring the highest sensitivity to the α-variation, namely, $^{235}U^{91+}$. The HFS transition energy of 190 THz is in the optical range, and the enhancement factor K_α is as large as 6.2. Among the Li-like HCIs, we focus on the ground state of Li-like Bi, with parameters very close to those of H-like U. The fact that highly charged Bi ions have been studied experimentally already for many years [38, 39] is an additional advantage for future measurements. However, the natural linewidth for $^{235}U^{91+}$ and $^{209}Bi^{80+}$ of $\sim$1 Hz is much larger than in ultranarrow transitions considered so far, therefore breaking the condition (2), which will be further discussed in the following section.

INFLUENCE OF THE NATURAL LINEWIDTH ON THE EXPERIMENTALLY OBSERVED SPECTRA

According to Eq. (2), the natural linewidth of the transitions under consideration should be lower than the potential variation of the transition energy caused by the variation of different fundamental constants. The maximal enhancement factor for optical transitions in stable atomic systems was found to be K_α, on a level of 100 [14, 28, 29], whereas the anticipated potential fractional variation of α is $10^{-18} - 10^{-19}$/year [10], based on astrophysical results. As a result, only ultranarrow transitions, with a metastable excited state featuring a lifetime of the order of years or longer, have received a great deal of experimental interest as promising candidates for the experimental search of the variation of fundamental constants.

However, as it was mentioned in [30, 40], for ultranarrow transitions the experimentally observed width of the line is limited by the laser bandwidth. For an ultrastable optical laser with a quality factor of $10^{14} - 10^{15}$, such linewidth cannot be better than 1–10 Hz. The best, ultrastable lasers, developed for precision spectroscopy at optical energies down to 50 THz, allow one to resolve even narrower lines with a natural width less than 40 mHz [41], e.g., in $^{197}Au^{78+}$ and $^{175}Lu^{68+}$. In Figs. 1 and 2 we plot the simulated final population of the excited state in a two-level system driven by a laser of fixed duration τ_L (given by the laser stability) and fixed intensity, as a function of its detuning [42, 43]. In Fig. 1, few cases are considered for intensities associated with π-pulses, i.e., pulses inducing a complete inversion of population at the end of the pulse in conditions of vanishing detuning and decay rate:

$$I_\pi = \frac{\pi E^3}{6\hbar^2 c^2 \Gamma \tau_L^2}. \tag{8}$$

In the first case (red curve), an ultranarrow optical transition with the lifetime of 2 years (linewidth of 3×10^{-9} Hz) is considered, with the corresponding π-pulse intensity of $\sim$ 1 W/cm^2. This corresponds to optical transitions in atomic systems featuring configuration level crossing, such as Ir^{17+}, currently considered as the main candidate for the laboratory experimental search of α-variation. For HFS $M1$-type optical transitions in U^{91+} and Bi^{80+} (blue and green curves, correspondingly), with linewidths of 1.2 Hz and 1.9 Hz, respectively, the π-pulse intensity is less than 10^{-9} W/cm^2. The pulse duration is set equal to 120 ms, corresponding to a laser bandwidth of $\sim$ 10 Hz [44]. As one can see, the observed width of the lines in all three cases is mostly determined by the bandwidth of the laser.



FIG. 1. (Color online) Excited-state population after excitation by a π-pulse for the ultranarrow (red), U^{91+} HFS $M1$ (blue), and Bi^{80+} HFS $M1$ (green) optical transitions.

SYSTEMATIC EFFECTS AND UNCERTAINTIES OF THE TRANSITION ENERGIES

The most important systematic effects for the HFS of H-like and Li-like HCIs were considered in [12, 30]. In atomic-clock systems, one of the most important systematic uncertainties originates from the electric-quadrupole shift due to trapping-field gradients. This effect can be significantly suppressed via different methods [45, 46], which nevertheless can lead to a significant increase in measurement time. In the ground states of H-like and Li-like systems, the first-order quadrupole shift vanishes completely, since the total angular momentum of the electrons is equal to 1/2. Other systematic effects (magnetic field, black body radiation, Doppler effects, gravity) for HCIs have been discussed in [12, 30, 45] and shown to be lower than $10^{-19} - 10^{-20}$ for the fractional uncertainty of the transition energy.

Choosing non-ultranarrow transitions provides an additional advantage, i.e., the lower laser intensity required for the full excitation of the ions in the trap. For fixed transition energy, the π-pulse intensity grows proportionally to the lifetime of the excited state, see Eq. (8). Therefore, the excitation of an ultranarrow transition (red curve) requires a laser which is by several orders of magnitude more intense than necessary for the excitation of a broader line. This is displayed in Fig. 2, where the results are shown for the three above-mentioned systems. The optical transitions, exhibiting very different natural widths, are assumed to be excited by a laser pulse with a duration of 120 ms and a fixed intensity of 6×10^{-10} W/cm^2, which corresponds to a π-excitation for the $M1$ HFS transition in Bi^{80+} (green curve). A low-intensity laser is significantly more advantageous, since AC-Stark shifts are highly suppressed [47, 48]. However, for an ultranarrow line, the excited-state population is almost 10 orders of magnitude lower compared to $M1$ HFS transitions, leading to a proportionally weak experimentally observed signal.

The transition energy for, e.g., $^{235}U^{91+}$ and $^{209}Bi^{80+}$ ions is about 190 THz, in the range of high-stability lasers, while the natural linewidth of $\sim$1 Hz is lower than the bandwidth of an ultra-stable laser. With a pulse duration of 120 ms, one needs to have a laser intensity of less than 10^{-9} W/cm^2 to have a π-pulse. With the anticipated potential variation of $\Delta\alpha/\alpha$ on the level $10^{-18} - 10^{-19}$/year, and the enhancement factor of $K_\alpha \approx 6$, the relative change in the transition energy for $^{235}U^{91+}$ and $^{209}Bi^{80+}$ will be on a level of $6 - 60 \times 10^{-19}$/year, which is 6 to 60 times larger than the predicted experimental fractional accuracy of the transition energy [12, 30].

Though the enhancement factor for HFS is about an order of magnitude lower than for the best transitions in highly charged iridium [28] and other complex atomic systems [13, 14], the HFS demonstrates significant advantages for an experimental observation, such as simple single-line spectra, the absence of the electric-quadrupole shift because of the selection rules, significantly suppressed AC-Stark shifts because of the low-intensity lasers to be used, and other systematic effects significantly reduced because of the higher charge number of the ion.



FIG. 2. (Color online) Excited-state population following ion-laser interaction with a pulse duration of 120 ms and a fixed intensity of 6×10^{-10} W/cm^2 (the π-pulse corresponding to the $M1$ transition in Bi^{80+}), for the ultranarrow (red), U^{91+} HFS $M1$ (blue), and Bi^{80+} HFS $M1$ (green) optical transitions.

HFS TRANSITION IN THE GROUND STATE OF H-LIKE U AND IN THE GROUND STATE OF LI-LIKE BI AS CANDIDATES FOR THE OBSERVATION OF THE VARIATION OF FUNDAMENTAL CONSTANTS

So far, we have focused on the variation of the transition energy caused by the variation of the fine-structure constant α, and showed that its potential variation can be observed in HFS of simple atomic systems, even though the enhancement factor K_α is about one order of magnitude smaller compared with level-crossing systems. However, the variation of other fundamental constants also contributes to the shift of the energy, as it was written in Eq. (3). The variation of the electron-proton mass ratio contributes to the energy shift with an enhancement factor equal to 1 for all ions. The last two terms appear in Eq. (3) due to the potential variation of the quark masses, leading to the variation of the magnetic moment μ of the nucleus. However, our estimation of this effect, following the procedure proposed in [31], shows it to be negligible for all ions, except for $^{159}Tb^{64+}$ and $^{197}Au^{78+}$ with $K_q = 1.165$.

Variation of the quark masses. In order to illustrate how HFS of HCIs can be used to investigate the variation of the quark masses, we consider the sensitive (to the variation of the quark masses) HFS clock $^{159}Tb^{64+}$ with the insensitive (to the same quantity) HFS clock $^{153}Eu^{62+}$ used as a reference. $K_{e/p} = 1$ for both clocks and their α-sensitivities are very close, leading to a low relative α-sensitivity $K_\alpha[\mathrm{Tb}] - K_\alpha[\mathrm{Eu}] = 0.07$, whereas the relative sensitivity to the variation of the quark masses is large, $K_q[\mathrm{Tb}] - K_q[\mathrm{Eu}] = 1.216$. This means that a combination of those two clocks would provide a unique opportunity to test the variation of the quark masses via atomic transitions in the optical domain. Also another pair of ions, $^{197}Au^{78+}$ and $^{199}Hg^{79+}$, would provide the same experimental test. The comparison of two HFS clocks, sensitive and insensitive to the variation of the quark masses (e.g. $^{159}Tb^{64+}$ and $^{153}Eu^{62+}$, or $^{197}Au^{78+}$ and $^{199}Hg^{79+}$) on the level of 10^{-17}/yr, would immediately provide the same level of accuracy in assessing limitations on the variation of the quark masses $\frac{m_q}{\Lambda_{\mathrm{QCD}}}$, since the relative sensitivity coefficient is $K_q \approx 1$.

Variation of the fine-structure constant and electron-proton mass ratio. Once limits on the variation of quark masses are discussed, one can focus on the experimental search for the variation of fine-structure constant α and electron-proton mass ratio m_e/m_p. By combining one of our proposed HFS of HCIs clocks (for simplicity let us consider the clock with a small sensitivity $K_{q,s}$ to the variation of quark masses) with other existing clocks, one could explore the possible variation of α and m_e/m_p [10]. The relative variation of the HFS energies is always linear in $\frac{\delta(m_e/m_p)}{m_e/m_p}$, see Eq. (3), for any HFS-based system. Therefore, in order to isolate the dependence of HFS on α-variation, the HCI clocks we put forward should be compared with another clock system also based on HFS. This would allow one to cancel the contribution of the m_e/m_p variation, enabling one to see pure α-variation in time. By comparing it with clocks not based on HFS, e.g., the electric octupole transition in ytterbium with $K_\alpha = -5.95$ [10], one could have a system with the effective enhanced sensitivity of[49] $K_\alpha^{\mathrm{HFS}} - K_\alpha^{\mathrm{Yb}} - 2 \approx 10$, and provide additional constraints for $\frac{\delta\alpha}{\alpha}$ and $\frac{\delta(m_e/m_p)}{m_e/m_p}$ [50]. Moreover, taking the linear combination of the transition energies of clocks based on HFS and clocks not based on HFS, one can have a constraint on $\frac{\delta(m_e/m_p)}{m_e/m_p}$ only. Though the sensitivity of the proposed



FIG. 3. (Color online) The current limits for the variation of the fine-structure constant $\frac{\delta\alpha}{\alpha} = -2.0(2.0) \times 10^{-17}$/yr and electron-proton mass ratio $\frac{\delta(m_e/m_p)}{m_e/m_p} = 0.5(1.6) \times 10^{-16}$/yr together with the new limitations based on the comparison of HFS clocks with insensitive atomic clocks on the level of 10^{-17}/yr, given by Eq. (9).

HFS clocks is of the same order as the sensitivity of Yb E3 clocks, the signs of those two contributions are opposite. Therefore, both clocks combined together would lead to an additional enhancement factor of around 2.

The current limitations [10] for the variations are $\frac{\delta\alpha}{\alpha} = -2.0(2.0) \times 10^{-17}$/yr and $\frac{\delta(m_e/m_p)}{m_e/m_p} = 0.5(1.6) \times 10^{-16}$/yr. The opposite signs of these variations mean that, in a HFS-based clock, observing the variation of the fine-structure constant can be hindered by the variation of the electron-proton mass ratio, since they partly cancel each other. However, the relatively large error bars for both variations allow the contributions to add as well, leading to an enhanced sensitivity. Moreover, different linear combinations, mentioned before, could provide new, more accurate limitations for the variation of both fundamental constants.

New limits on the variation of the fundamental constants with the HFS of HCIs. Finally, let us establish which constraint on the variation of the fundamental constants could be provided by the measurements with a HFS HCI clock and some reference clock. In order to focus on a conservative scenario, we choose insensitive ($K_\alpha = K_{e/p} = 0$) atomic clocks. The accuracy level of both HFS and reference clocks are also conservatively assumed to be only 10^{-17}/yr, 2 or 3 orders of magnitude lower than the estimated systematic effects for the HFS of HCIs [12, 30]. Then the comparison of the proposed HFS clock ($K_\alpha = 6$, $K_{e/p} = 1$, $K_{q,s} \approx 0$) with the reference atomic clock on the chosen level of accuracy would lead to the new limitation:

$$\left|(K_\alpha^{\rm HFS} - K_\alpha^{\rm insen.} - 2)\frac{\delta\alpha}{\alpha} + \frac{\delta(m_e/m_p)}{m_e/m_p}\right| < 10^{-17}/\text{yr}. \tag{9}$$

The current limit for the variation of the fine-structure constant α and the electron-proton mass ratio m_e/m_p together with new possible constraints are plotted in Fig.3. The improvement of the current limitations can be clearly seen even for the assumed conservative scenario. Any advantage either in the enhanced sensitivity of two clocks or in their accuracy would provide even more stringent limitations on the possible variation of fundamental constants.

CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

We showed that intraconfiguration transitions can be used for the laboratory search for a potential variation of α, m_e/m_p, and even $m_q/\Lambda_{\rm QCD}$. Laboratory measurements of the HFS of simplest atomic systems, namely, of H-like and Li-like ions, with currently available experimental techniques, can be performed to the 19th decimal, allowing one to observe those potential variations. The transition-energy variation caused by an anticipated change of the fine-structure constant in the time interval of one year is estimated to be 6 to 60 times larger than the expected experimental accuracy of the transition energy. By direct simulation of the ion-laser interaction, it was shown that in the Rabi scheme ultranarrow transitions have no critical advantages in comparison to transitions of Hz width, since the observed width of the line is determined by the laser bandwidth. Furthermore, the use of the considered hyperfine

$M1$-type splitting instead of ultranarrow transitions in configuration-level-crossing systems would allow one to reduce the measurement time due to the absence of a quadrupole splitting and the ability to use a much less intense laser for the excitation of the ground state, suppressing AC-Stark shifts. Thereby, we put forward experimentally promising candidate ions for the search for fundamental-constant variation with intraconfiguration transitions between HFS components in simple atomic systems.

[1] W. J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 489 (1984).
[2] S. M. Carroll, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 3067 (1998).
[3] J.-P. Uzan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 403 (2003).
[4] E. Reinhold, R. Buning, U. Hollenstein, A. Ivanchik, P. Petitjean, and W. Ubachs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 151101 (2006).
[5] J. K. Webb, V. V. Flambaum, C. W. Churchill, M. J. Drinkwater, and J. D. Barrow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 884 (1999).
[6] M. T. Murphy, J. K. Webb, and V. V. Flambaum, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **345**, 609 (2003).
[7] R. Srianand, H. Chand, P. Petitjean, and B. Aracil, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 121302 (2004).
[8] J. K. Webb, J. A. King, M. T. Murphy, V. V. Flambaum, R. F. Carswell, and M. B. Bainbridge, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 191101 (2011).
[9] S. Schiller and V. Korobov, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 032505 (2005).
[10] A. D. Ludlow, M. M. Boyd, J. Ye, E. Peik, and P. O. Schmidt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **87**, 637 (2015).
[11] O. Y. Andreev, L. N. Labzowsky, G. Plunien, and G. Soff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 243002 (2005).
[12] S. Schiller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 180801 (2007).
[13] J. C. Berengut, V. A. Dzuba, and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 120801 (2010).
[14] M. S. Safronova, V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, U. I. Safronova, S. G. Porsev, and M. G. Kozlov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 030801 (2014).
[15] V. Shabaev, O. Andreev, A. Artemyev, S. Baturin, A. Elizarov, Y. Kozhedub, N. Oreshkina, I. Tupitsyn, V. Yerokhin, and O. Zherebtsov, Int. J. Mass Spectr. **251**, 109 (2006).
[16] V. M. Shabaev, D. A. Glazov, G. Plunien, and A. V. Volotka, J. Phys. Chem. Ref. Data **44**, 031205 (2015).
[17] A. V. Volotka, D. A. Glazov, O. V. Andreev, V. M. Shabaev, I. I. Tupitsyn, and G. Plunien, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 073001 (2012).
[18] K. Schnorr, V. Mäckel, N. S. Oreshkina, S. Augustin, F. Brunner, Z. Harman, C. H. Keitel, J. Ullrich, and J. R. Crespo López-Urrutia, Astrophys. J. **776**, 121 (2013).
[19] N. S. Oreshkina, S. M. Cavaletto, C. H. Keitel, and Z. Harman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 143001 (2014).
[20] N. S. Oreshkina, S. M. Cavaletto, C. H. Keitel, and Z. Harman, Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics **49**, 09400
[21] M. C. Simon, J. R. Crespo López-Urrutia, C. Beilmann, M. Schwarz, Z. Harman, S. W. Epp, B. L. Schmitt, T. M. Baumann, E. Behar, S. Bernitt, R. Follath, R. Ginzel, C. H. Keitel, R. Klawitter, K. Kubiček, V. Mäckel, P. H. Mokler, G. Reichardt, O. Schwarzkopf, and J. Ullrich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 183001 (2010).
[22] S. Sturm, F. Köhler, J. Zatorski, A. Wagner, Z. Harman, G. Werth, W. Quint, C. H. Keitel, and K. Blaum, Nature **506**, 467 (2014).
[23] V. M. Shabaev, D. A. Glazov, N. S. Oreshkina, A. V. Volotka, G. Plunien, H.-J. Kluge, and W. Quint, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 253002 (2006).
[24] V. A. Yerokhin, E. Berseneva, Z. Harman, I. I. Tupitsyn, and C. H. Keitel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 100801 (2016).
[25] A. V. Volotka and G. Plunien, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 023002 (2014).
[26] A. Windberger, J. R. Crespo López-Urrutia, H. Bekker, N. S. Oreshkina, J. C. Berengut, V. Bock, A. Borschevsky, V. A. Dzuba, E. Eliav, Z. Harman, U. Kaldor, S. Kaul, U. I. Safronova, V. V. Flambaum, C. H. Keitel, P. O. Schmidt, J. Ullrich, and O. O. Versolato, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 150801 (2015).
[27] H. Bekker, O. O. Versolato, A. Windberger, N. Oreshkina, R. Schupp, T. M. Baumann, Z. Harman, C. H. Keitel, P. O. Schmidt, J. Ullrich, and J. R. Crespo López-Urrutia, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **48**, 144018 (2015).
[28] J. C. Berengut, V. A. Dzuba, V. V. Flambaum, and A. Ong, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 210802 (2011).
[29] V. A. Dzuba, M. S. Safronova, U. I. Safronova, and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 060502 (2015).
[30] V. I. Yudin, A. V. Taichenachev, and A. Derevianko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 233003 (2014).
[31] V. V. Flambaum, D. B. Leinweber, A. W. Thomas, and R. D. Young, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 115006 (2004).
[32] V. M. Shabaev, in *Atomic Physics with Heavy Ions* (Springer, Berlin, 1999) p. 139.
[33] E. Y. Korzinin, N. S. Oreshkina, and V. M. Shabaev, Physica Scripta **71**, 464 (2005).
[34] N. S. Oreshkina, D. A. Glazov, A. Volotka, V. M. Shabaev, I. I. Tupitsyn, and G. Plunien, Physics Letters A **372**, 675 (2008).
[35] I. Klaft, S. Borneis, T. Engel, B. Fricke, R. Grieser, G. Huber, T. Kühl, D. Marx, R. Neumann, S. Schroder, P. Seelig, and L. Volker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 2425 (1994).
[36] I. Angeli and K. P. Marinova, At. Data Nucl. Data Tables **99**, 69 (2013).
[37] N. J. Stone, At. Data Nucl. Data Tables **90**, 75 (2005).
[38] M. Lochmann, R. Jöhren, C. Geppert, Z. Andelkovic, D. Anielski, B. Botermann, M. Bussmann, A. Dax, N. Frömmgen, M. Hammen, V. Hannen, T. Kühl, Y. A. Litvinov, R. López-Coto, T. Stöhlker, R. C. Thompson, J. Vollbrecht, A. Volotka, C. Weinheimer, W. Wen, E. Will, D. Winters, R. Sánchez, and W. Nörtershäuser, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 030501 (2014).

[39] P. Beiersdorfer, A. L. Osterheld, J. H. Scofield, J. R. Crespo López-Urrutia, and K. Widmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 3022 (1998).
[40] N. Hinkley, J. A. Sherman, N. B. Phillips, M. Schioppo, N. D. Lemke, K. Beloy, M. Pizzocaro, C. W. Oates, and A. D. Ludlow, Science **341**, 1215 (2013).
[41] T. Kessler, C. Hagemann, C. Grebing, T. Legero, U. Sterr, F. Riehle, M. J. Martin, L. Chen, and J. Ye, Nat. Phot. **6**, 687 (2012).
[42] M. O. Scully and M. S. Zubairy, *Quantum Optics* (Cambrige University Press, Cambridge, 1997).
[43] S. M. Cavaletto, C. Buth, Z. Harman, E. P. Kanter, S. H. Southworth, L. Young, and C. H. Keitel, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 033402 (2012).
[44] N. Huntemann, M. Okhapkin, B. Lipphardt, S. Weyers, C. Tamm, and E. Peik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 090801 (2012).
[45] A. Derevianko, V. A. Dzuba, and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 180801 (2012).
[46] V. A. Dzuba, A. Derevianko, and V. V. Flambaum, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 054501 (2012).
[47] H. Häffner, S. Gulde, M. Riebe, G. Lancaster, C. Becher, J. Eschner, F. Schmidt-Kaler, and R. Blatt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 143602 (2003).
[48] N. Huntemann, B. Lipphardt, M. Okhapkin, C. Tamm, E. Peik, A. V. Taichenachev, and V. I. Yudin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 213002 (2012).
[49] The term -2 is originated by the different definitions of the sensitivity coefficient K_α in different references - with or without the separation of the Rydberg constant in the transition energy.
[50] N. Huntemann, B. Lipphardt, C. Tamm, V. Gerginov, S. Weyers, and E. Peik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 210802 (2014).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge helpful discussions with D. A. Glazov, J. R. Crespo López-Urrutia, L. Schmöger, and V. Debierre.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

NSO, SMC, and ZH conceived the idea. NSO calculated HFS data and prepared figure 3, NM calculated the BW correction, SMC performed the simulations and prepared figures 1 and 2. NSO and SMC wrote the main manuscript text. All authors contributed to the discussion of the technical aspects and results, and preparation of the manuscript.

COMPETING FINANCIAL INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing financial interests.